

REMARKS

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pritty.

Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended to include a control bit in the transaction descriptor to retain information about a change in the active schedule and preventing the transaction from starting if the control bit indicates a change in the active schedule. Specifically, claims 1, 7, and 13 include the limitations “a control bit to retain information related to a change in the active schedule” and “preventing the transaction from starting if ... a change in the active schedule is indicated by the control bit.”

Pritty does not disclose a control bit in the transaction descriptor to retain information about a change in the active schedule and preventing the transaction from starting if the control bit indicates a change in the active schedule. Pritty discloses a LAN priority control system which uses an interrupt priority control structure which suspends transmission of a packet from a lower priority node and allows a higher priority node to obtain access to the transmission medium (Abstract). As illustrated in Figure 3, the LAN consists of a token ring having a plurality of nodes 12, each of which includes an access unit 20 and a host device 22, which is coupled to the token ring via the access unit 20 (Col. 6, lines 44-49). The LAN permits host computers having a higher priority than the priority of the circulating token to obtain access to the ring and suspend transmission of the

message on the ring by utilizing an extra control channel (Col. 6, lines 49-54). Any node 12 can request a less important transmission to be suspended using a within packet interrupt, and the node 12 currently sending a data packet around the ring can accept or reject this request according to a number of data bytes still to be transmitted (Col. 6, lines 55-60). Whether or not a particular node 12 decides to interrupt the data transfer of a packet depends on the amount of untransmitted data within the packet (Col. 7, lines 20-24). For example, an algorithm may be present in the node 12 which recognizes the percentage of data still to be transmitted, and if the amount of data is less than 10% of the total data or a fixed number of bytes, the interrupt request would be ignored and the message completed (Col. 7, lines 24-29). However, when more than 10% of the data is remaining, the interrupt request is accepted and the station increments the priority of the token by successive recirculation of the busy token to equal the priority of the particular node (Col. 7, lines 30-34). Pritty makes no mention of a control bit in the transaction descriptor which retains information about a change in the active schedule or preventing the transaction from starting based on the control bit. Pritty thus discloses interrupting a first transmission of data for a second transmission of data if the second transmission of data has a higher priority than the first transmission of data and a predetermined amount of data in the first transmission has not yet been sent. Specifically, Pritty does not disclose a control bit and the transaction descriptor to retain information about a change in the active schedule and preventing the transaction from starting if the control bit indicates a change in the active schedule.

Therefore, claims 1, 7, and 13 are not anticipated by Pritty because claims 1, 7, and 13 include a limitation that is not disclosed in Pritty.

Claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18 are dependent on either claim 1, claim 7, or claim 13 and should be allowable for the same reasons stated above.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pritty.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pritty.

Claims 2, 8, and 14 have been cancelled.

Claims 5, 11, and 17 are dependent on either claim 1, claim 7, or claim 13 and should be allowable for the same reasons stated above.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 5, 11, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pritty.


In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Mark A. Kupanoff at (408) 720-8300.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 7, 2004


Mark A. Kupanoff
Reg. No. 55,349

Customer No. 008791
12400 Wilshire Blvd., 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300